

## **REMARKS**

Claims 20-28, 30 and 31 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowability of claims 34 and 36-38.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 20-28 and 30-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huff et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,408,391) (hereinafter "Huff") in view of Monroe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,392,692 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 20 and 28 are amended to recite an aircraft. Huff describes security servers 500 and 600 that reside respectively on trucks 700 and 732 (FIG. 5; col. 13, lines 43-63). There is no disclosure of any network user on either truck 700 or 732. Huff also describes vehicles 722, 724, 726, *etc.* that each contain a personal computer 112 (col. 5, line 55; FIG. 5; col. 14, lines 19-22). None of the personal computers 112 described by Huff, however, are disclosed as being accessible to a plurality of users in a truck, nor is it inherent in Huff for any one truck to contain more than one personal computer 112. Anticipation by inherent disclosure is appropriate only when the reference discloses prior art that must *necessarily* include the unstated limitation. *Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Services, Inc.*, 290 F. 3d 1364, 62 USPQ 2d

1865 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Neither Huff nor Monroe, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "...an onboard network accessible to a plurality of users onboard the aircraft..." as recited in claims 20 and 28 as amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 and claims 21-27 dependent on claim 20, and claim 28 and claims 30-31 dependent on claim 28 should be allowed over Huff and Monroe.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7521.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 21, 2008

By: 

Elizabeth D. Odell, Reg. No. 39,532

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

EDO/nr